United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMER United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,442	03/26/2004	John W. Ketchum	000252C1	8969
23696 OUALCOMM	7590 12/13/2007 INCORPORATED	EXAMINER		
5775 MOREH	OUSE DR.		CORRIELUS, JEAN B	
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/13/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com kascanla@qualcomm.com nanm@qualcomm.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/810,442	KETCHUM, JOHN W.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jean B. Corrielus	2611			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATED IN THE OF THIS COMMUNICATED IN THE OF TH	TION. be timely filed 6 from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 November 2007</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-30 and 38 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6,16-21 and 38 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 7-15 and 22-30 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance ion is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/26/04. 	Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) fail Date mal Patent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/810,442 Page 2

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 and 38 are objected because of the following informalities: claim 1, last line, "to be" should be deleted. the same comment applies to claim 16, line before last; claim 23, line before last and claim 38, last line. claim 8, line 2, "trellis" should be inserted before "coding" so as to provide proper antecedent basis for subsequent recitation in line 3; line 3, "code" should be "coding" so as to be consistent with antecedent in line 2, last line, "to be" should be deleted. Claim 38, line 3, "means" should be inserted before "channel" and "block" should be deleted so as to be consistent with antecedent. Note that any claim whose base claim is objected is likewise objected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-6, 16-21, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen US patent No. 7154846 in view of Kim et al US patent No. 7,072,324.

As per claim 1, Chen discloses a method and apparatus fig. 1D comprising supplying an input bit stream to a channel coding block 860; modulating an output of the channel coding block 860 to provide a modulation symbol sequence using modulator 866 feeding the modulation symbol sequence to a plurality of orthogonal sequence

covers using demux 870 each of the plurality of orthogonal sequence covers outputs one of a plurality of spread sequences of output chips see col. 8, lines 16-19. However, Chen does not teach that the plurality of spread sequences are transmitted over a MIMO channel. Kim et al teaches the transmission of a plurality of spread sequences over a MIMO channel see fig. 4 antenna A and B and col. 1, lines 19-32. given that fact, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to implement such a teaching in Chen in order to improve signal detection because MIMO channel are know to be more resistant multipaph and other type of channel effects that if left uncompensated tend to affect signal quality.

As per claim 2, Chen teaches the demux 870 feed the replica of the modulation sequence to each of a plurality of orthogonal sequence covers see 8, lines 16-19.

As per claim 3, see claim 2.

As per claim 4, Chen does not teach that the plurality of covers comprises mutually orthogonal Walsh cover. Kim teaches that the plurality of covers comprises mutually orthogonal Walsh cover see col. 2, lines 54-56. Given that fact, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to include such a teaching in Chen in order to minimize interference between the codes.

As per claim 5, at col. 8, line 14, Chen teaches that the modulation scheme employed is a QAM modulation Scheme does not explicitly teach trellis coded QAM scheme. However, it is well established in the art to used trellis code in combination with QAM. Given that, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to use the QAM modulation in combination with trellis code in order to satisfy the requirement of the

Application/Control Number: 10/810,442 Page 4

Art Unit: 2611

system and to take advantage of its enhanced technological feature such as generation of modulated signal with reduce signal to noise ratio.

As per claim 6, Chen teaches a rate of 1/3 or 1/5 instead of using a rate of n-1/n. however, it is well known in the art of coding theory to use a coder having a rate of n-1/n. given that one skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Chen to use a coding rate of n-1/n in order to satisfy coding requirement of the system so as to generate coded signal having a desired coding rate.

As per claim 16, see claim 1.

As per claim 17, see claim 2.

As per claim 18, see claim 3.

As per claim 19, see claim 4.

As per claim 20, see claim 5.

As per claim 21, see claim 6.

As per claim 38, see claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claims 7 and 22, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. Claims 8-15, and 23-30 would be allowable if amended to overcome the objection set forth above.

Application/Control Number: 10/810,442 Page 5

Art Unit: 2611

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean B. Corrielus whose telephone number is 571-272-3020. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chieh Fan can be reached on 571-272-3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Primary Examiner 12-7-07

Art Unit 2611